

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 45-47 and 49-53 are cancelled, without prejudice.

Claim 31 is currently amended.

Claims 58-62 have been added.

Claims 31-44, 48, and 54-62 are now pending of which Claims 31, 40, and 48 are independent.

Requirement for Restriction

The Examiner has required restriction between Claims 31-39 and 54-56 (Group I), Claims 40-44 and 57 (Group II), Claims 45-47 and 49-53 (Group III), and Claim 48 (Group IV). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the requirement for restriction.

The Office Action recognized that if the search for Group I would be required for the invention of another group, then restriction would not be proper. See also, MPEP 803, *et seq.* Here, the search for the invention of Group I would require that the features identified in the Office Action as unique to Group II and Group IV also be searched. The claims directed to Group III have been cancelled.

With regard to Group II, the claims identified as belonging in Group I included Claim 55 which recites “wherein an image displayed based on the second amount of information has a same resolution as an image displayed based on the first amount of information.” A search for this feature would necessarily include a search for the feature identified in the Office Action as unique to Group II – namely a “display mode using a same size amount of a display.”

With regarding to Group IV, the claims identified as belonging in Group I included Claim 33 which recites “wherein in the second mode only textual types of graphical information are displayed.” A search for this feature would necessarily include a search for the feature identified in the Office Action as unique to Group IV – namely a “only texture [sic] types of graphical information are displayed.”

Since the search for Group I would also include a search for the features of Groups II and IV identified by the Office Action as being unique to those Groups, withdrawal of the requirement for restriction between Groups I, II, and IV is respectfully requested. Thus, examination of all of Claims 31-44, 48, and 54-62 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extension fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 1, 2008

By /Marcus A. Burch/

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5839
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Marcus A. Burch
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 52,673